



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,971	02/02/2001	John D. Shaughnessy	D6138	3345

7590

06/05/2003

Benjamin Aaron Adler
ADLER & ASSOCIATES
8011 Candle Lane
Houston, TX 77071

EXAMINER

YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,971

Applicant(s)

SHAUGHNESSY, JOHN D.

Examiner

Christopher H Yaen

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.
2. Accordingly, claims 9-10 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicant is reminded to cancel claims drawn to non-elected subject matter.
3. Therefore, claims 1-8 are examined on the record. Claims will be examined to the extent that they read on the elected sequence, namely SEQ ID No: 1.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because the description of the figures do not match the title of the figures (see for example figure 7A and 7B, the identification in the "Brief Description of the Drawings" should correspond to the figure titles). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 5, and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 5 and 7-8, as written, do not sufficiently distinguish over nucleic acids and cells as they exist naturally because the claims do not particularly point out any non-

Art Unit: 1642

naturally occurring differences between the claimed products and the naturally occurring products. In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring products are considered non-statutory subject matter. See *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). The claims should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, e.g., by insertion of "Isolated" or "Purified" as taught by page [insert page number] of specification. See MPEP 2105.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

7. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. With regard to claims reciting the term "hybridizes" or "selectively hybridizes", it is unclear from the specification as to what the intended metes and bounds of the term, because the specification has not defined the conditions to which hybridization is to occur.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

Art Unit: 1642

possession of the claimed invention. The written description in this case has only set the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID No: 1, and therefore the written description for this case is not commensurate in scope to claims that read on variants, fragments, and allelic variants of SEQ ID No: 1.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117). The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 115).

What are allelic variants? Reiger et al (Glossary of Genetics and Cytogenetics, Classical and Molecular, 4th Ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976) clearly define alleles as one of two or more alternative forms of a gene occupying the same locus on a particular chromosome..... and differing from other alleles of that locus at one or more mutational sites (page 17). Thus, the structure of naturally occurring allelic sequences are not defined, nor in this case, is the structure of allelic variant proteins encoded by allelic variant genes defined. With the exception of SEQ ID No:1, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed polynucleotides and or encoded variants and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate

Art Unit: 1642

written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The sequence itself is required.

See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Lts.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. Although these court findings are drawn to DNA art, the findings are clearly applicable to the claimed proteins.

Furthermore, although drawn specifically drawn to the DNA art the findings of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412) are clearly applicable to the instant rejection. The court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, usually defined by a nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states that "An adequate written description of a DNA...requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties', not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention".

Support for allelic variants is provided in the specification on page 23-26. However, no disclosure, beyond the mere mention of fragments, variants and allelic variants is made in the specification. This is insufficient to support the generic claims as provided by the Interim Written Description Guidelines published in the June 15, 1998 Federal Register at Volume 63, Number 114, pages 32639-32645.

Art Unit: 1642

Therefore only an isolated Evi27 sequence having nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID No:1 meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantially asserted utility or a well established utility.

The disclosed utilities for the Evi27 sequence is for the modulation of expression so as to treat cancer or auto immune disease. However, neither the specification nor any art of record teaches what Evi27 is, how it functions, or a specific and well-established utility for any of the fragments, variants or allelic variants claimed. Furthermore, the specification does not teach a relationship to any specific disease or establish any involvement in the etiology of any specific disease. The asserted utility is based on the fact that the ligand for Evi27, which allegedly activates NF-kB and stimulate IL-8 production, and the restricted expression of Evi27 in hematopoietic cells may lead to the developments and disease processes of the cells. These are all speculated roles for the instantly claimed nucleic acid. The discovery of the instant invention was based in part on the screening of hundreds of genes, wherein an upregulated gene would indicate that the gene may be involved in a disease state. There is no indication from the specification that the protein encoded by SEQ ID No: 1 exists, translated, or whether it is overexpressed.

It is well known in the art that regulation of mRNA translation is one of the major regulatory steps in the control of gene expression (Jansen, M et al, 1995, Pediatric Res, 37 (6): 681-686). Those of skill in the art recognize that expression of mRNA, specific for a tissue type, does not dictate nor predict the translation of such mRNA into a polypeptide. For example, Alberts et al. (Molecular Biology of the Cell, 3rd edition, 1994, page 465) teach that translation of ferritin mRNA into ferritin polypeptide is blocked during periods of iron starvation. Likewise, if excess iron is available, the transferrin receptor mRNA is degraded and no transferrin receptor polypeptide is translated. Many other proteins are regulated at the translational level rather than the transcriptional level. For instance, Shantz and Pegg (Int J of Biochem and Cell Biol., 1999, Vol. 31, pp. 107-122) teach that ornithine decarboxylase is highly regulated in the cell at the level of translation and that translation of ornithine decarboxylase mRNA is dependent on the secondary structure of the mRNA and the availability of eIF-4E, which mediates translation initiation. McClean and Hill (Eur J of Cancer, 1993, vol. 29A, pp. 2243-2248) teach that p-glycoprotein can be overexpressed in CHO cells following exposure to radiation, without any concomitant overexpression of the p-glycoprotein mRNA. In addition, Fu et al (EMBO Journal, 1996, Vol. 15, pp. 4392-4401) teach that levels of p53 protein expression do not correlate with levels of p53 mRNA levels in blast cells taken from patients with acute myelogenous leukemia, said patients being without mutations in the p53 gene. Yokota, J et al (Oncogene, 1988, Vol.3, pp. 471-475) teach that the retinoblastoma (RB) 115 kD protein is not detected in all nine cases of lung small-cell carcinoma, with either normal or abnormal size mRNA, whereas the RB protein is

Art Unit: 1642

detected in three of four adenocarcinomas and all three squamous cell carcinomas and one of two large cell carcinomas expressing normal size RB mRNA. Thus, predictability of protein translation or the extent of translation is not solely contingent on mRNA expression due to the multitude of homeostatic factors affecting transcription and translation. For the above reasons, one of skill in the art would not be able to predict if SEQ ID NO:1 is translated into a polypeptide expression product, or even if translated, whether it is overexpressed.

The specification essentially gives an invitation to experiment wherein the artisan is invited to elaborate a functional use for the disclosed polypeptide and fragments thereof. Because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific asserted utility for the reasons set forth, credibility of any utility cannot be assessed.

Claims 1-8 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantially asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H Yaen whose telephone number is 703-305-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1642

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Christopher Yaen
Art Unit 1642
June 2, 2003


ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600